

D. Dickerson's comments on 9/11/09 "Alternative 1" ESD Cost Estimate @ \$80m/yr  
3/1/10

Page 1 of 11

1. The summary should add a column for "Total Cost with 3.5% Escalation".
2. The column header "CDF LTM" should be changed to "CDF GW Monitoring".
3. The column header "Capital Costs" should be changed to "Other Costs".
4. The column header "Total Costs (0% discount)" should be changed to "Total Costs 2010 \$ (0% discount)".
5. The p.1 costs for "CDF LTM" appear to not include the costs for GW well redevelopment/installation (see other general comments: GW wells for CDFs were installed in 1999/2000).
6. A cost for 30 years of CDF O&M should be included as an additional line item under the summary spreadsheet. Lets discuss further as this is a new issue. For reference see Table 9 of the 1998 ROD - NPW of \$1.1m using discount factor of 7% - but this was based on 4 CDFs.

Fixed Costs

7. Instead of using 2005 and 2008 costs for the bases of the fixed costs, recommend using 2009 actuals for each of the 8 categories.
8. Have all fixed cost categories been adjusted to reflect the significantly higher funding level of \$80m/yr?
9. p.3 of 11: for clarity, suggest adding a comment for "NAE Expenditures" that these are yearly costs.
10. p.4 of 11: for clarity, recommend adding a last line item showing the total of all fixed costs (currently \$76,225,727 from p.1 of 11)

Hydraulic Dredging

11. p.5 of 11: Recommend using the actual 2009 unit cost instead of the 2008 estimated unit cost.

T&D Costs

12. p.6 of 11: As discussed, double check that the unit costs have been converted from tons to cubic yards.

### Build and Cap CDFs

13. p.7 of 11: For clarity, recommend adding a new line item listing the total for this activity to match that found on p.1 (\$86, 189,375).

### Fill CDFs

14. p.8 of 11: According to p.6 (T&D) no filter cake is placed into CDFs in year 6, yet p. 1 shows the \$5,245,455 listed here (for 60,000 cy of placement) being spent in year 6.

15. General comment: as discussed, double check issue of stockpiling filter cake as required for Alternative 2, \$80m/yr.

### GW Monitoring

16. p.9 of 11: For clarity, and to avoid confusion with long term CDF O&M, recommend changing “LTM” and “LONG TERM MONITORING” to “GW” and “GROUNDWATER MONITORING”.

17. p.9 of 11: Groundwater wells at each CDF were installed in the 1999/2000 timeframe, so well redevelopment rather than well installation may be the more appropriate activity to estimate (should confirm that these wells are still in place).

18. p.9 of 11: note comment #5 above, the cost for well installation (or well redevelopment if the wells still exist) do not appear on the p.1 summary.

### Capital Costs

19. p.11 of 11: Recommend changing “CAPITAL COSTS” to “OTHER COSTS”

20. p.11 of 11: As discussed, for clarity recommend not showing all line items having to do with CAD cells.

21. p.11 of 11: “Narragansett LTM Round #5” should be deleted as this activity has already been completed.

22. p.11 of 11: recommend changing “Narragansett LTM ROUND #6” to “Benthic LTM Round #6”, AND changing this from year 5 to year 6.

23. p.11 of 11: similar to the recent public meeting estimates, recommend assuming that confirmational sampling be covered by fixed costs, so that this line item can be deleted.

24. p.11 of 11: see comment #17 above: the last line item here may need to be changed to “WELL REDEVELOPMENT” if the existing monitoring wells are still available.

END

